

## REMARKS

Claims 12, 14-19, 34-39, 67, 69-79, and 93-161 will be pending in this application after the Examiner enters the forgoing amendment.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 12. Applicant has amended claim 12 to address this objection by the Examiner.

On pages 2-4, the Examiner rejected claims 12, 34, 67, 74, 121, 138, and 155 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being “as being indefinite.” Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with these rejections, some of which were applied to text appearing in the claims of an issued ancestor of the instant application and/or seem to be the result of strained interpretations, these rejections may now be moot in view of remarks, amendments, or clarifications to the claims.

On page 3 the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 34 under § 112, second paragraph, stating:

the limitation “generating network addresses in response to an internetwork address” as recited is vague and indefinite. It is unclear to the Examiner what the Applicant means by “in response to an internetwork address”. Where was the internetwork address before it was received?

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that there is no requirement that claims 12 or 34 specify a location of the “the internetwork address before it was received.” “Breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness.” Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) 2173.04.

On page 4 the Examiner rejected claim 34 under § 112, second paragraph,

stating:

the limitation “moving the portable card to the store” as recited is vague and indefinite. It is unclear to the Examiner who moves the card to the store. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that there is no requirement that claim 34 specify a limitation on who moves the card. MPEP 2173.04.

On pages 3 and 4 the Examiner rejected claims 12, 34, 67, 74, 121, 138, and 155 under § 112, second paragraph, stating, “. . . It is unclear to the Examiner what the Applicant means by ‘corresponding’.” Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the word “corresponding” is a common one that is both clear and supported in these contexts. For example, the recited “signal corresponding to a product” is exemplified by (but is not limited to) data packet 3002 shown in Fig. 3A, including coupon data 3030; or text field 5020 shown in Fig. 5 and described on page 10, lines 18-19; or the binary format of the coupon information shown in Fig. 15A and described on page 22, lines 2-6. Of course, these recited “signal corresponding to the product” are not so limited. For example, this signal may be a number such as the U.P.C. coupon code, as described in the U.P.C. Coupon Code promulgated by the Uniform Code Council, Inc., Dayton, Ohio.

On page 3 the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 67 under § 112, second paragraph, stating:

the limitation “wherein the second computer includes circuitry for receiving first signals” as recited is vague and indefinite. It is unclear to the Examiner if the first signals received are the same as the first signals that where sent in line . . .

Applicant respectfully submits, however, this text, which appears in the claims of an issued ancestor of the instant application, is clear. The circuitry is for receiving first signals that were the object of the recited "circuitry for sending first signals."

On page 4 the Examiner rejected claim 34 under § 112, second paragraph, stating:

the limitation "sending, responsive to the signal received in the previous step" as recited is vague and indefinite. It is unclear to the Examiner to which signal the Applicant is referring.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, this text, which appears in the claims of an issued ancestor of the instant application, is clear. The term "the previous step" clearly refers to the step reciting "receiving a signal corresponding to a product . . .," and because that step recites a particular signal, the following step's recitation of "the signal received in the previous step" is clear.

If the Examiner has any questions about this amendment, Applicant's representative would appreciate discussing this amendment with the Examiner. Applicant's representative, Jerome Jackson, can be reached at 703-684-4840.

Respectfully submitted,



Jerome D. Jackson  
Reg. No. 33,186

Jackson Patent Law Office  
211 N. Union Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone 703-684-4840  
Facsimile 703-995-0318

DATED: *1 August 2006*